DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 919 JC 810 355

AUTHOR Wattenbarger, James L.
TITLE The Role of the Professional Educator as the College Development Officer. Resource Paper No. 7.
INSTITUTION National Council for Resource Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 11p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Council for Resource Development (1st, April 1975).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role: *Administrators: College Administration: College Planning: *Community Colleges: Educational Planning: Financial Support: *Fund Raising: Management Teams: *Organizational Objectives: Publicity: School Business Officials: Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Development Officers (College)

ABSTRACT

College developmental officers must be professional educators who work within an administrative team along with the president, dean of instruction, the student development officer and the college business officer. While the members of this team should understand the principles of management, they must also appreciate the institution's collegiate goals relating to accountability, the accommodation of varying student backgrounds, open admissions, community education, institutional evaluation, and staff and program development. A 1962 study suggested that the functions of the development officer should include: (1) securing acceptance of the college's goals: (2) keeping staff and the public informed of the decisions of the board: (3) releasing information about the college to the mass media: (4) supervising the production of promotional materials: (5) promoting bonds of loyalty with alumni and other groups: (6) administering campus planning: (7) presenting the college's needs to philanthropic organizations: (8) interpreting the college's fiscal program for the board: and (9) promoting the interests of the college before government agencies. Though federal legislation since 1962 has narrowed the responsibilities of the development officer to fund-raising, this official must nonetheless develop resources with college goals in mind and must be a professional educator with an understanding of the total college program. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2039919

RESOURCE PAPER NO. 7

THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR AS THE COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

by

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger

Director of the Institute
of Higher Education

and

Chairman of the Department of
Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

March, 1976

Presented April, 1975 at the
First Annual Meeting of the
Florida Council for Resource Development

NCRD
National Council for Resource Development
Suite 410
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

JC 810 355

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Kerns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR
AS THE COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

This is an area in which I have a great deal of interest, perhaps from a different point of view than that of the points you have been talking about during the last couple of days. This is what I really want to talk about: a different point of view. As Harvey Sharron and I talked about the topic I should discuss, it appeared to us that I really ought to have some opportunity to emphasize your role as a professional educator. You aren't a hustler; your aren't a huckster; you aren't a money-raiser; you are really a professional educator and that is the basis on which these remarks are developed.

Those of you who have studied college administration are well aware of the fact that there are basically five functions which must be accommodated if you are going to administer a college or university. These functions are found in any institution. They include, first of all, the executive function which normally is centered in the President or the President and his closest advisors. This is a necessary function for the operation of any institution, whether it be educational, business, military, governmental, or any other kind of organizational structure.

Then there are four other functions which really are peculiar in many ways to the operation of an educational institution. One of these is the instructional function, the academic function. This is a definable function which is usually centered in someone who is called Dean or Vice President for Instruction.

There is the student development function which is designed and centered around providing services to students - services they need outside of class - helping them to get registered, helping them to find out what needs they have in order to carry out their educational activities.

Then there is a business operations function which we usually center in a Vice President for Administration or the Business Manager who, in some instances. may think that the institution revolves around that function but, in other instances, recognizes the function as a service to the college student.

The final function is one which is usually neglected in most institutions: the college development function, the function which is designed to develop the college as a total institution. This is really what your major responsibility should be, although quite often it is not clearly defined in the descriptions of the job that people carry out.

If you sit down to analyze these five functions, it will appear to you very rapidly that they have a relationship with each other and the manner in which each function is accomplished has been the subject of concern to many who seek to improve the operational management of colleges and universities. This has been especially true during the past ten to fifteen years.

Starting with Rourke and Brooks and their important little volume on The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education, and then continuing on with Millet, Richardson, Blocker and Bender, Lehti, Kerr, as well as many others with whom you are familiar, we have had increasing emphasis placed upon the revolution in college management. Line and staff relationships have been analyzed continuously. The varying concepts of bureaucratic management have been pulled apart and put back together again. They have been criticized and supported. Boxes and solid lines have been exchanged for circles and dotted lines, overlapping and superimposed. Etsioni, Likkert, Herzberg, Simon, Avantzavich, McGregor, Drucker, all of these saints of modern management theory, have been consulted and their ideas have been used in trying to develop a better way of managing an institution of higher education. Emphasis upon quality has been sought through focus upon the concept of quality control, through accreditation, and through evaluation involving procedures for achieving a better accountability as well as improving operational activities through a systems approach to

administration. We must all admit that improved college management is a worthwhile goal and it is achieved through the use of techniques developed through modern management theory as well as through the application of well-proven procedures related to the systems approach and organized quality control. We must also recognize, however, that people still constitute the key to any administrative team and that it is essential to know that a college is not an industrial corporation, nor is it a "production line" operation. A college must have personnel who can apply the principles of management theory to a collegiate situation in an appropriate way.

The administrative team must be constituted then of educators who understand that a collegiate institution is based on some goals such as these:

First: the concept of accountability may be instituted by defining outcomes, by differentiating processes and by evaluating results for all the undertakings of the institution. This is not an easy thing to do. One of the little volumes I was reading in connection with preparing for this paper was New Directions in Institutional Research which is published by Jossey-Bass through the Association for Institutional Research. I guess this was one of the first volumes they published on evaluating institutions. There is an article by Howard Bowen in which he outlines very specifically (and I think very cogently) the difficulties which are involved in evaluating institutions through the process of accountability, e.g., defining outcomes, inputs, costs benefits, as well as the kinds of problems associated with doing these things for an educational institution. If we are really serious about the concept of accountability, we need to begin by this process of defining outcomes and this is a part of the concern of the Development Officer as a member of the total administrative team.

Second, the educational program will be provided through a process which accommodates individual differences in learning rates, aptitudes, and prior knowledge. There is probably no institution that should be more conscious of this than the community college. Many of the kinds of projects and concerns that you have in getting that

little extra bit of money which makes all the difference in a quality institution and a namby-pamby one is dependent upon getting the money to help you do some of these things which do not come through ordinary resources.

Third, an institution should be developed whose total environment is dedicated to learning and is open to those who desire to learn. Another concept which is very much involved in the operation of the community college, and which we tend sometimes to forget, is the concept that all students are important. The first things that people start to discard in times of stress are the things that really make the institution special, different, and important. This fall, I'll bet that some of the Florida colleges will be quite willing to discontinue in this time of stress the things they are doing for students who are not the ordinary type of student, for the students who need special help. This will happen just as we are beginning to get a better and more equitable representation of the minority students and of women and older people. We will in all likelihood curtail faculty development programs and institutional research. We are going to begin for the first time, in a few institutions, a limited enrollment policy which will probably use high school senior placement test scores for admission quotas.

I understand and I empathize with the problems we have in serving all the students who should be served, but I think that when we back down on some of the basic principles on which the institutions were established, then we are in the process of destroying the institution as it was originally conceived.

A fourth goal is that the total community should be utilized as a laboratory for learning. This is something to which we have given little attention, something to which the Resource Officer, the Development Officer must give particular attention because he may be the only one on the administrative team who is conscious of this.

Fifth, a program for continuous institutional evaluation must be developed and

implemented. In other words, we must provide for evaluation of all the programs in the institution.

Sixth, an institution must be developed which is administered with due consideration for rational management that allows the individual to grow and develop within the organization and provides for appropriate participation in the governance of all the constituent groups.

A seventh goal is that the educational program provided in the institution prepares students for entry into and appreciation of actual careers, not some imagined career or something we think ought to be happening in the community, but what actually is happening in the community.

Eighth, an educational program is provided that facilitates human development.

Ninth, an educational program is provided that facilitates the development of a broadly educated person.

Tenth, an educational program is provided that engenders in each student a concern for excellence and a desire for continuous learning.

And finally, programs and activities are designed and implemented that contribute to the educational, economic, social and cultural development of the host community.

Now, it may occur to you that these are the goals which are not of particular concern to the college Development Officer, but this is the point I want to make most strongly in this speech: these are goals which are of concern to you. Your concern is not in getting money for the institution, but in finding ways of implementing the goals described above. If it takes more resources to implement some of these goals, then that fits into the total pattern as a part of your responsibilities, but not as the center and focus of your responsibilities. The particular goals which I have outlined were used in Brookdale, New Jersey, and have been the basis for their management by objective development there. You can see how it might be very appropriate for anyone such as yourself to develop your own management objectives in line

with the goals of your institution. These goals are important to each member of the administrative team and they are important to the total faculty. If everyone sees their job in the perspective of the goals of the institution, then you have started in the right direction.

It is particularly important that the Business Managers and Development Officers be recruited from the areas of occupations which have education as a professional background. There have been suggestions of late that it might be easier if the Board of Trustees had a Business Officer reporting directly to them for business and an Educational Officer reporting directly to them for the educational program. I would suggest that this sort of divided administrative structure is not one that is sound and solid because it would create a divided institution in which business operations, for example, would become the major purpose of the Business Officer and educational problems the major purpose of the Educational Officer. Somebody would still have to be President and that individual should not be Chairman of the Board which would be the obvious result if the total goals of the institution are not being considered by the total administrative team.

Ayers and Russel in their 1962 analysis of the organization and administration of colleges and universities noted that the officer in charge of development should do the following things:

First of all, the officer in charge of development should be responsible for developing an integrated program which defines, popularizes, and secures acceptance of the major goals and objectives of the institution and for relating them to the institution's various policies. Even back in 1962 they were talking about a development and public relations officer who was sensitive to the major goals and objectives of the institution.

Second, he should be responsible for keeping before the college officials and the general public a list of the most specific current and long-range educational

fiscal and financial objectives and programs approved by the Board of Trustees, together with means and techniques for achieving them.

Third, he should be responsible for developing and putting into effect policies and procedures for maintaining information and news services of excellence and for providing a supervisory arrangment for the release of information through the mass media. Emphasis once again is on providing information to the public.

Fourth, he should be responsible for formulating policies that govern the content, form, scope, and distribution of all college publications of a promotional character, and, in cooperation with other major officials, supervising the production of the annual catalog, student publications and similar publications.

Fifth, he should be responsible for developing means and techniques for promotion of a strong bond of loyalty and friendship between the institution and its alumni, the parents of students, the college sponsors, and similar special interest groups.

Sixth, in close cooperation with others he should develop and execute policy for the guidance of campus and facility planning and provide for its supervision.

Seventh, in close cooperation with the President, he should be responsible for presenting the needs of the institution to philanthropic organizations, to individuals, to industrial and commercial corporations, to the sponsors of the institution, and to the prospective donors for capital costs of operating the college. (You notice that item 7 says in cooperation with the President; the others say the officer in charge of development will be responsible. Item 7 ties the officer up with the President as do items 8 and 9).

Eighth, under the direct supervision of the President and in close cooperation with the Business Manager, he should assist in the interpretation of the current financial program of the institution to the Board of Trustees and other pertinent individuals and officers.

Ninth, as directed by the President, he should promote the interest of the institution before agencies such as those in the Federal government with resources for financing desirable programs.

Tenth, he should be the administrator of the department and the resources of his department in the college.

Well, as you know, these were written in 1962 before very many Federal bills for support of higher education in particular had been developed. More recently, in 1973, Bender, Richardson, and Blocker described the Director of Developmental Services in five specific and direct statements: he should arrange for location of Federal funding; he should assist the President in increasing state support; he should prepare and carry out proposals to foundations; he should encourage private giving; and he should be in charge of alumni affairs and ways of tapping this source of funds.

The change from what Ayers and Russel said in their summary and what Bender, Richardson, and Blocker said in theirs is mainly a change from an interest in interpreting and helping the development of the total face of the college to the public, to a concentration almost entirely upon developing sources of funding. I think there is probably a place somewhere in between this that I would really prefer to see assigned as the responsiblility to this officer. The Federal laws that were developed through 1962-65 in particular have changed the emphasis in this particular office from the interpretation of goals and carrying out general duties that were outlined by Ayers and Russel to these more specific relationships with sources of funding. It is, however, more important that an individual be on the administrative team which understands the professional obligations, responsibilities, and commitments which are required in carrying out the goals of the college program.

Ed Gross in his dissertation at the University of Florida examined the effects of Federal funds upon an institution and he noted that it is important that the funds

brought into the institution under Federal grants have some very special relationship to the total program of the institution. Here I go back to what seems to me the most important responsibility which you may have and one to which you need to be particularly sensitive. If you cannot find support in keeping with the goals of the institution and if the ways of supporting the institution from sources other than the ordinary sources do not fit into the goals or mission of the institution, then you are barking up the wrong tree. You are hindering, not helping, the college. The funds which come from sources other than the ordinary sources must enhance the existing program and must provide for continuing services to programs which are already in existence. They must be used to start new programs which can be absorbed into the regular on-going college responsibilities. Funds should be obtained in such a way that they will provide for continuing services in areas, with appropriate wind-down activities so that the programs will not be left high and dry and unsupported when the funds are gone. They should involve the faculty in planning as well as in the implementation of all requests or proposals for gifts and grants.

In other words, these kinds of activities can only be carried out effectively by one who is a professional educator, who understands the responsibility of the college, and who is an accepted member of the total faculty. He cannot be an entrepreneur; he cannot be a hustler; he cannot be someone who operates outside the college goals and purposes. It is the duty and responsibility of this individual to be a professional educator first, a part of the team who understands the total college program.

Reprints are not allowed except with permission of the National Council for Resource Development

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

AUG 7 1981